

REMARKS

This is submitted in response to telephone calls November 16 and 22, 2004, a proposed amendment faxed November 17, 2004.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by DeWeese. Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC §103 on the combination of DeWeese and York. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC §103 on the combination of DeWeese and Patel, while claim 6 was similarly rejected on DeWeese and Kawashima. The main reference was DeWeese.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite "a calibration device capable of calibrating any of the plurality of said instruments." In addition, claim 7 recites "a database having a calibration procedure for any of the plurality of said instruments". None of the references provides a device for, or a method of calibrating any of a plurality of instruments. DeWeese provides test strips which set up a machine (calibrate?) with parameters that characterize the assay being performed. There is nothing to suggest any device for, or method of calibrating vibration measuring equipment. The current methods, as described fully in Applicant's specification, is to ship the instrument to a remote lab. Applicant enables on-site calibration of any of a variety of vibration measuring instruments.

Surely, these amendments clearly distinguish claims 1 – 10 from the cited art and make them allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Turner



by David A. Greenlee, Reg. No. 20825

Attorney of record

Tel 614-854-9150; Fax 614-854-9155

November 29, 2004

Docket 30658

This Response and Amendment was faxed to the USPTO, Art Unit 2863 @ 703-872-9306 On November 29, 2004 by